



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5114

Application No.: 10/608,187

Page 8

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 13 and 14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b).

Claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yasuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,842,371) (hereinafter "Yasuda et al.") in view of Saishu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,391) (hereinafter "Saishu et al.").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 remain pending in this application for further consideration with claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 13 and 14 being withdrawn from further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yasuda et al. in view of Saishu et al. To the extent that the Examiner may consider the rejection to apply to the newly amended claims, it is respectfully traversed as being based upon a combination of the applied references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features now clearly recited in the claims.

With regard to each of independent claims 1 and 9, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least a recited feature

of “wherein an electric field is applied to the ferroelectric liquid cell by using a leakage current of the thin film transistors so as to improve response characteristics of the ferroelectric liquid crystal device.” This feature is fully supported by at least paragraph [0058] of the specification.

The Final Office Action alleges in Section 10 that “Yasuda discloses an electric field alignment method of a twisted nematic (TN) liquid crystal display device (see Column 22, Lines 17-21),” and that “Saishu clearly does disclose using ferroelectric liquid crystal (FLC) in place of twisted nematic (TN) liquid crystal (see Column 1, Lines 20-32).” Moreover, the Advisory Action alleges on the Continuation Sheet that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al. are combination. Applicants respectfully disagree that a combination of Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al. renders the present invention obvious.

In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claims 1 and 9, Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al. are completely silent about applying an electric field to the ferroelectric liquid cell by using a leakage current of the thin film transistors so as to improve response characteristics of the ferroelectric liquid crystal device. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the feature of “wherein an electric field is applied to the ferroelectric liquid cell by using a leakage current of the thin film transistors so as to improve response characteristics of the ferroelectric liquid crystal device,” as recited by each of newly-amended independent claims 1 and 9.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409

F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Office Action has not established a prima facie obviousness rejection.

For at least the reasons as those discussed above and the arguments presented in Request for Reconsideration filed on August 11, 2006, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of newly-amended independent claims 1 and 9. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 2-3, 6 and 10-12 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon respective independent claims 1 and 9 and for the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Xiaobin You

Reg. No. L0112

Date: September 14, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001